

No part of the candidate's evidence in this exemplar material may be presented in an external assessment for the purpose of gaining an NZQA qualification or award.

S

93404A



934041

SUPERVISOR'S USE ONLY

TOP SCHOLAR



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

QUALIFY FOR THE FUTURE WORLD
KIA NOHO TAKATŪ KI TŌ ĀMUA AO!

Tick this box if you
have NOT written
in this booklet

☐

Scholarship 2022 Classical Studies

Time allowed: Three hours
Total score: 24

ANSWER BOOKLET

Check that the National Student Number (NSN) on your admission slip is the same as the number at the top of this page.

Write your answers to your THREE chosen questions in this booklet. Start your answer to each question on a new page. Carefully number each question.

Check that this booklet has pages 2–23 in the correct order and that none of these pages is blank.

YOU MUST HAND THIS BOOKLET TO THE SUPERVISOR AT THE END OF THE EXAMINATION.

Question 4. (Appearance of Monarchy)

Augustus was being the pioneer of a shift in Roman structures from a republic to an empire, certainly had skill and an acute awareness of the power structures that preceded and surrounded him. This awareness, of course, began with the cause of his meteoric rise in power and influence in the first place; that is, the death of his adoptive father Julius Caesar. The assassination, [⊗] provided a poignant insight of Augustus in the horns of appearing & similar to a monarch, and became a lesson he learned keenly from the point onwards of 27 BC as he was crowned with his new name. Of course, the statement's inclusion of "extent" suggests a nuance that we should judge with: thus the court of judgement upon Augustus begins, with an analysis of constitutional ~~reform~~ names, ~~reform~~ and ~~succession~~ power and legacy. [⊗] carried out and justified by the assessors in the name of "protecting the Republic",

To begin, in a ~~keen analysis~~ we might pay keen attention to how Augustus set the tone for his rule. That begins with

the first new name he took on¹ as he finally monopolised all power ^{following} the death of Mark Antony. Names, while for a Roman woman were trivial, were essential for Roman men — depicting lineages, connections, and for Augustus, associations ~~as~~ associative meanings. Taking on Caesar's name gave "ex-Octavian" power and an entourage of willing clients, and thus 'Caesar' is ~~ob~~ shall obviously be retained in his new name; but the question hence lies of what to replace "Octavian" with, as it reflected his less noble equestrian father lineage. Cassius Dio wisely notes that "Augustus himself vehemently desired to be called Romulus... but when he detected suspicion, he gave it up". This is a reflection of his avoidance of the appearance of a monarchy. To suggest that it was successful is perhaps true, but Of course, on while Romulus was given up, Augustus had to choose a new different but similarly grand name. Augustus, from "Augury", ~~as~~ associated with the Augurs that had great interpretive powers in the will of the gods, seemed an adequate choice; and thus began the reign of Augustus with his accumulation of power. It certainly, while not choosing Romulus was a success ⁱⁿ the view of Augustus' sentiments, ~~the~~ choice of Augustus as a name was rather a close

avoidance; the absolution of power maintained a facade appropriate for its Roman audience, the majority of which either didn't care (the vast majority ^{of the Roman public} were illiterate and didn't necessarily understand the depth of power) or didn't want to do anything (the senators at this point had realised Augustus' influence after the high profile triple triumphs and Antony's death so likely weren't able to carry out much against Augustus without destabilising the "Republic") & however, perhaps for the modern audience this usage of power is striking.

Where the avoidance of the Monarchy appearance became more testy led in the consideration of power. As Augustus himself claimed, "I excelled all in influence [auctoritas] but held no greater power [potestas] than the others" (Res Gestae Divi Augusti). Those such as Alison Cooley who ~~clearly~~ regarded RGDA as a political document certainly may regard ~~the~~ critique this claim as ~~off~~ ~~as~~ propagandistic lies — and in this situation, no one inclined to agree. The apparent monopolisation of power carried out by Augustus was extensive and ~~bank~~ exhaustive, one that might be best broken down through examining the powers Augustus in constitutional settlements. Aside from the name awarded in 27 BC, Augustus was

also awarded a ^{Golden} shield in commemoration of his war triumphs and the title of *proconsular imperator*. *Proconsular imperator*, in particular, reflects a monopolisation of power where *imperator* insinuates a ~~power~~ significance above all else. This is furthered with the second and third settlements which included but were not limited to honours of: *proconsular imperator* *maius* (where *maius* made this title perpetual for Augustus), *tribunicia potestas* (the power of the tribunes), and *consular potestas* (the power of the consul). The power of the tribunes, in particular, ~~was limited only to~~ theoretically ~~was~~ only able to be taken up by plebeians; I question that this power was truly provided to Augustus without second thoughts on what this implicated in Augustus' status of ~~absolute power~~ ~~and~~ use of power and influence. Further more, titles of *Princeps* and *pater patriae* carried forms of power which were of symbolic significance: first citizen was crucial in the appearance of "citizen", but the ^{underlying} emphasis is obviously placed on the "first" rather than of this title. Similarly, being the "father of the country" was simply one word short of becoming a full blown monarchy — the power ~~father of pater~~ the "father" in Roman classical culture is deeply embedded as a convention of absolute control (*patria potestas*), and thus it is hard to believe that Romans did not consider the what ^{role} Augustus took on as the

one ^{taking up} ~~embodying~~ connotations of absolute power over the entire country.

From this point, what we might see is a shifting from a complete success of maintenance in appearance to a more risky foundation: where although no "monarch" ~~or~~ or "dictator" was mentioned, the connotations of the 'first' and 'absolute power' ~~proved~~ ~~testy~~ ~~in~~ ~~held~~ stopped just short of an overt declaration. We now reach ~~the place where~~ Augustus was "not successful" ^{and} in legacy. To put this in context, we must first ask ourselves: who was Augustus avoiding ^{the appearance} for? Heading back to my introduction, we may notice that it was by the hands of the republican senators that Julius Caesar had died. The people were ^{loosely} happy with Caesar's mores, so long as they had enough food to eat and did not have a roof over their heads. Thus, Augustus did only need to avoid the ~~presence~~ ~~of~~ ~~a~~ ~~presence~~ of a monarchy within Rome and its proximate regions; elsewhere, he was "unsuccessful" — not because he couldn't succeed, but because he didn't need to 'succeed'. This was reflected in the legacy he instilled in the provinces. ~~It~~ Cassius Dio ~~again~~ mentions the presence of "statues of Augustus alongside Roma to be worshipped in the provinces," which "disappeared ~~as~~ in Rome or areas of provinces

close to Rome with many Roman references! For many of Religion, in cultures beyond Rome, was ~~by~~ instrumental in creating the monarchy. Augustus observed this in Egypt, and of course allowed for his likenesses to be installed; ~~at~~ this continual worship of ~~the~~ his statues following the previous pharaohs ~~in~~ in Egypt reflects an obvious continuation of Augustus' role as the monarchy also. The ~~dis~~ disappearance of these statues near Rome is a reflection of Augustus' "Magnificent" careful balancing act. ~~When he~~, ~~was~~ ~~reg~~ not building overt associations between him and being a deity on the level of Rome in the presence of Romans who would certainly grow suspicious. Succession, ~~on the other hand~~, ~~was~~ ~~for~~ This became a legacy, not only in these permanent states — some of which can be found in the empire — but a custom of emperor worship that persisted in the provinces as an obvious reflection of the Monarchy.

The biggest problem that resulted in the downfall of the Roman Monarchy, ~~before~~ ~~August~~ ~~app~~ a few centuries prior was the corruption of the Kings and dissatisfaction of the people. Augustus, as the one who "feed the sea from fishes" ~~and~~ ~~also~~ (RGDA), "built aqueducts" (RGDA), and established a Pax Romana upwards of 200 years

^{intend}
 of 'peace' certainly doesn't belong to the likes
 of these great kings. From analysis, it is
 obvious that ~~there~~ the normal aspect
 was the only the component of Augustus'
 success in ~~avoiding~~ avoiding appearances.
 Power and ~~the~~ legacy, especially in rhetoric
 that did not require and avoidance, were
~~about as close~~ in form as similar to
 a Monarchy as one could get. ~~Nevertheless~~
~~Nevertheless~~, ~~to quote~~ Thus, the extent ~~it~~ stayed
 as Dio notes, "a monarchy in all aspects
 but none" — marginal. But perhaps the better
 question lies: ~~was it necessary~~ did it
 matter? For the Roman people and senators,
 perhaps it didn't after all; regardless
 of the delicate facade in appearance
 was maintained in the way that, despite
 despite ~~deeper~~ ^{that} even the slightest depth
 of consideration would have fallen, no one
 cared enough to think deeper.

Question Twelve (12)

Virgil had significant creative liberties in his creation of the Aeneid. Perhaps it was due to his pastoral background, but we observe an internal tension between ~~pastoral~~ tenderness and brutality within the Aeneid — a reflection of the internal gentility of perhaps that original farm boy who wrote the Georgics and Eclogues, being forced to contend with the violent, bloodthirsty noise of a Rome not yet ^{fully} escaped from its centuries of civil war. The characters who suffer at the hands of Aeneas is perhaps no greater example of this phenomenon. Truly, through pudor, Virgil extends his sympathy to these unwitting characters; however, the limits of this extension perhaps exists at the disconnect between ~~the~~ Virgil's intent and that received by the Roman listeners in context.

We begin with Dido, Queen of Carthage. ~~the most cruel~~ She is one of the first examples of Virgil's creative liberties; in the original Greek myth of Aeneas, Dido did not have as big a role as ~~she~~ the one she plays in the Aeneid. ~~Through~~ Her stage presence thus provided Virgil and opportunity ~~for~~ to flesh out her character.

into the intelligent and passionate Queen of
 Carthage we find Aeneas encountering in Book 1.
~~and her~~ Certainly, the association between
 Dido and connotations of Dido's skills
 impressive great: emphasis is used in noting the
 grandness of her city and palaces, describing
 a 'bustling population' with 'towering city walls'.
 Dido This power is perhaps to build a positive
 impression ^{on} of Roman readers of Dido, and
 certainly which supports her the building
 of sympathy later sympathy for in Dido's
 downfall. As noted by Lene, Dido is indeed:
 conventionally ashamed of her love of Aeneas,
 due to a multitude of factors such as her
 considerations of her first husband and Aeneas'
 destiny; this ~~likely~~ reinforcement of the ~~role~~
~~of~~ moral conventions of Rome potentially may
 have been to build stronger sympathy for Dido's
 plight and fears. However, it is not we cannot
 be sure as to whether Virgil's means was
 truly successful: ~~to~~ above all, we need to note
 Dido's status as a ~~to~~ woman and the double
 standards Romans held with respect to ~~women~~
 love ~~and~~ relationships for women and men.
 That Catherine Edwards notes that "Dido
 become a figure of a temptress in her attempts
 to corrupt fate" for the Roman people;
 in this way, perhaps the Romans did not truly
 gain any sympathy for Dido's death —

Perhaps a deserved turn of fate indeed, destined to
 become the resentful ghost in Book 6's
 visit to the underworld. It is also up for contention
 whether Virgil even fully attempted to create
 sympathy for Dido. For one, the beauty of
 Carthage is contrasted by the lament of
 Virgil in describing the "Great cranes that
 have come to a stand still" — with this
 contrast in productivity perhaps putting more
 negative connotations on Dido's newfound obsession
 of love. ~~For~~ For two, the death of Dido was
 preceded by a dramatic confrontation between
 Dido and Aeneas, during which Dido
 had desperately pleaded "in incomprehensibly
 long, ~~very~~ overflowing lines: "please — If I
 ever made you happy — please — please —
 have pity". These are contrasted with Aeneas'
 measured measured, staccato syllables of "I must
 leave. I thank you for your kindness".
 One could potentially claim that the proctor
 associated with this begging was truly to
 establish sympathy for Dido, ~~but it~~ ^{but it} seems more like a
 Aeneas' stoicism and desire to loyalty to his
 destiny. For the Roman readers this is perhaps
 a question for the modern readers to ponder
 more; for the Roman readers, the Dido's gender
 and association with her "fire of fire" of love
 was perhaps become the disconnect between
 whatever Virgil's intent was of sympathy

and their perceived intentions of 'a rightful punishment for Dido'.

In the second half of the Aeneid, the mortal Aeneas echoes the Iliad in asking for more opportunities for ~~of~~ Aeneas' opposition to face death that garner sympathy. Mezentius and Turnus are two such examples, ~~but~~ with similar views of ~~their~~ purpose and progression.

Mezentius' death amongst the chaos of the Latin war can perhaps be noted as a ~~tragedy~~: another brutal casualty of the war. However, Virgil's purpose in putting Mezentius in a humiliated ~~poor~~ position of begging is a reflection ^{both both} to create sympathy for Aeneas' victims, but also to contrast Aeneas' furor. There is a reason why no such pity was applied to ~~other~~ those such as Camilla or Pallas; for Pallas, he served as a touching catalyst for Aeneas to display his piety in funeral rites, while Camilla was to serve as a reminder of the importance of a leader in battle. These ^{characters} ~~people~~ did not get pity and ~~thus~~ not humanised them on some level, because Virgil had a different purpose for them; on a similar level, the creation of some pity for Mezentius — more likely to have evoked pity than Dido, as a man who dies in the context of war rather than

a woman who kills herself for love — is not for ~~establishing~~ ~~as a~~ for the purpose of a means to build sympathetic characters. Instead, it is to reflect the furor and cruelty of war, as Aeneas murders Mezentius and others in cold blood and rage. Duckworth's comment that the "Aeneid was a response to the canines of civil war that preceded it" thus helps explain Virgil's purpose in the death of ~~Turnus~~ Mezentius: indeed, one to use humilia to evoke sympathy for Mezentius, but moreover, to use that sympathy to propel the anti-war message at the core of Virgil's identity and censure Aeneas' cruelty, as the true end of the means.

Finally, the death of Turnus is a curious Jackson case. On the one hand, some critics claim such as Wilhelm claim that the death of Turnus is a form of "poetic justice", but on the other, some such as Edwards claim that the death is a "solemn warning". Its polarising nature is reflected in the tension that exists between sympathy created for Turnus and the justice of his ~~against~~ ~~his~~ egotistical murder of Pallas. However, ~~regardless~~ the moment of pudor comes starkly and suddenly, at the end of book 12: ~~as~~ Juno's sudden relentment comes to ~~save~~ make Turnus

to take a Council loss, to subject him to the
 destiny plotted out by fate: loss. ~~How~~ The degree
 of loss, however, lies in Aeneas' hands.
 We hear Turnus' pleas of his father's bid, heeding
 the values of piety; nevertheless,
 Aeneas, "boiling with rage, buries his blade
 deep in Turnus' ~~breast~~ breast"; and the soul
 is left to flee, "mourning, resentful, to
 the shades". This context alone may be
 strong argument for a puer used as the
 means for sympathy. However, if we
 take a step back and note that the
 reason Aeneas boiled with rage was because
 he saw Pallas' belt, ~~the~~ Virgil's masterful
 ambiguity comes through: is the ~~sy~~ humiliation
 and link to Roman piety an acknowledgement
 of Turnus' sympathy or an ~~po~~ ironic justice
 that in return for Turnus' prideful display
 of war spoils? We might suggest that there
 is some extent in ~~see~~ creating sympathy
 for Turnus, which could be ~~but~~ belated by
 Aeneas' defense of ~~piety~~ ~~piety~~ ~~piety~~ piety through
 justice for Evander; what we know for sure
 is that the connotations of rage are certainly
 not an admonishment of guilt, and the
 sympathy that is generated for Turnus is for
 the purposes of further admonishment. Finally,
 It could also be noted that this sudden, tragic
 ending aligns with the sympathy that Rome

~~listeners~~ ^{readers} feel for Turnus may contribute to a sense of incompleteness of the Aeneid, which serves the purpose of ~~setting up~~ allowing ~~the~~ Roman readers to feel that they were the ~~to~~ true glorious conclusion to this ~~to~~ ^{the} pseudo-historical epic.

To conclude, Dido, Mezentius, Turnus and others are but pawns in Virgil's masterful game of ambiguity. For ~~of~~ ^{all} of these characters, the ~~pudor~~ they bear ~~as~~ are in principle to create some extent of sympathy, although the nuances in these characters mean that there are varying levels of corollary implications.

For Dido, this looks like ~~the~~ her inner note: create a ~~shortfall~~ ^{shortfall} of discontent of felled sympathy for the Roman listeners; for Mezentius, this looks like ~~the~~ ^{being} mere means to the end of ~~the~~ ^{the}

Virgil's anti-war message; for Turnus, this looks like the admonishment of favored ~~camp~~ ^{camp} ~~manipulation~~ ^{manipulation} creation of incompleteness meant for the listeners to fulfill. The Aeneid is masterful in its ability to craft and maintain ambiguity; and it is precisely that note that allows us to write about it until today.

Section B question Seventeen (E-H),

Women were in a complicated position in Rome. They were certainly not as empowered as ~~today~~ many societies of today, but of their age they were at the least better treated than their Greek counterparts. Here, the Leg, let us examine the status of women through 3 lenses: the political, ~~the personal and the~~ and personal of the powerful, and the personal of more ~~mundane~~ common people.

The political state of women were highly limited. They could not vote; they were passed under authority, conceptually from men to men, from ^{the protectors of} their fathers to the Menus of their husbands. Nevertheless, certain exceptions within history exist, and Agrippa Agrippina is a poignant example. Her Resource H suggests of her power and status. From H(i), what we observe is a relief of skillful sculpture: Agrippina is the one crowning her son, the emperor, and they are on equal standing. This provides fascinating insight on the amount of power that this woman singularly achieved. Certainly, in contrast to the usual down cast eyes of women in south sculptures with men, Agrippina is

looking straight at Nero; she is ~~crossing~~ Nero, as the man, is instead the one with eyes down cast as he respectfully bowed by his mother. They ~~are~~ both cornucopias, suggesting that Agrippina also has part in the power ~~and~~ — she holds the cornucopia as a symbol of prosperity, ~~and has~~. This is a reflection of the unique control that Agrippina had over her sons' affairs, and ~~the~~ reflects the possibilities that a woman could still achieve in political status. This is further reflected in the coins as the the left face shows Agrippina and Nero face to face.

Coins were a key medium of propaganda; owing to their importance and widespread nature, the presence of Agrippina at such a level with Nero reflects her impressive power and high political status. These had obvious political implications, where Agrippina could advise the emperor of the vast Roman Empire and on many levels dictate affairs; her influence was manifested in resources ~~to~~ H (i) and (ii), in these permanent forms, but undoubtedly extended beyond records. Of course, this political anomaly ~~is~~ ^{was} destined to be unsustainable in Rome's deeply misogynistic society, and should be considered as such: she was ~~to~~ ^{was} murdered by the hands of

her son and notably said for them to "Get
 the womb hot she birthed him with just".
 A headstrong, ambitious woman who provided
 herself insight into the ~~boundaries~~^{true} boundary
 of a woman's political status; a reflection
 of how women's power ^{associations} were limited to
 the children they could ~~raise~~ birth and
 raise, but nevertheless an impressive record
 by Agrippa.

Agrippina is part of a handful of women
 who were successful in their campaign
 for political power — Livia being a notable
 (Clodia being no fable others — but for
 more insight we should look away from
 the extreme in to power and likelihood, and look
 more towards ~~personal~~ the personal, with a
 more representative view of the status of these
 powerful women. Resource F, ~~from Cicero~~
 a collection of letters from Cicero, reflects
 the status and power struggles of women in
 a more domestic sphere. Terentia is a more
 common example of a high status Roman
 woman, being the wife of the notable politician
 Cicero, but we must again note the distinction
 between her status and the other married
 Roman wives. She is ambitious and tries to
 touch in the sphere of Cicero's political perplexities,
 although notably less successful than Agrippa.

The first letter ~~from~~^{to} Atticus, a few years after their initial marriage, reflects a more idyllic role in personal status: Cicero considers his wife highly in her ability to provide moments of repose (along with his children). Of course, Cicero being a noted ~~tradit~~ conservative in the Roman political sphere (even of his time), is not light on his morals: he ~~considers~~ ~~to~~ addresses his daughter affectionately albeit slightly derogatorily as a pet without name, and sets up a dichotomy between his family and "the great". Nevertheless, he is affectionate, ~~and~~ which is further supported by his ~~home~~ personal letter to Terentia: "you are showing a virtue and courage surpassing belief" and asks her to "mind [her] send me letters - covers, that I may know what is going on and what you are all doing". This reflects a level of respect that even old Cicero holds for his wife. Of course, this is complemented by the final journey of their ~~late~~ marriage, as Terentia shows her ability to control matters in the domestic sphere; Cicero complains of insufficient funds as a reflection of Terentia's prudence (10 instead of 12 sestertii). This is ~~not~~ ~~conceivably~~ a reflection of Terentia's power and status on the personal level: for these well-off families who are likely to partake in more equal conjugal marriages, the many status is not necessarily as much as

one may ~~assure~~ assume with the presence of Menus ~~are~~ by the husband over the wife.

Nevertheless, even the privileged patrician families are not representative of the wider world of women's status in the Roman world: we now look to Resona G with funerary reliefs that reflect on freedwomen and their heirs. Vestina ~~and~~ Incunda and Katerii, both women with no association with particular political power, have successfully established themselves with wealth and prominence. They provide unique as put into the way that even normal women — moreover, those who were likely slaves — had some level of status in Rome which was perhaps higher than to be expected. They can be immortalised in the sculpture of a funerary relief, as seen by Vestina Incunda, or even better, be immortalised lastingly in a well-carved tomb as she is depicted to recline on a couch with her family at the top of Resona G (iii). ^{CP20} Of course, there are still some subtle bonds of status — for example, Incunda's betrothal or ring is a reflection of wider Roman customs in which the women wear iron rings around their middle fingers, to promote chastity as doctors claimed that the middle finger takes

counted a nerve that ~~linked to~~ to their hearts. ~~For the sake of, the woman~~
 (prose p20) Her wealth is also established with elaborate carvings and the presence of slaves which she had the authority to free.

However, to conclude, ~~what~~ ~~we~~ while we may appreciate the insight these resources provided in explaining the status that women can acquire, we ~~may~~ need to acknowledge caveats. The status that these women acquired certainly subverts some level of expectation that Rome was always a strict misogynistic patriarchy (a title perhaps better reserved for the Greeks), these resources are not representative of the ~~truth~~ ~~the~~ population. Notably, Cicero's Pro Caelio speech in response to reflect this more generalized sentiment: the Roman's sins in slavery but wealthy or free were recorded as sinful. ~~For~~ ~~the~~ other resources, their immorality ~~and~~ ~~status~~ is a result of their unusually high status — economically, politically, personally or otherwise — and are not representative of the vast majority of women who ~~are~~ ^{did not have as high of a status} forced to remain voiceless and faceless, with nothing in the Marbled Room that was willing to record their lies.

→ ② It is no surprise that we should see the

tragic end of Agrippine or the divorce of
 Terentia, and they also remind us of
 what usually happens when a woman attempts
 to reach higher status as men may do, or
 their reliance on men be y merciful
 to maintain their status.]